

REMARKS

This response is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated November 4, 2005. In view of the following discussion, the Applicants believe that all claims are in allowable form.

RESTART OF RESPONSE PERIOD

Applicants filed a Petition to Restart the Response Period on February 8, 2006, as the Office Action dated November 4, 2005 did not mail from the Patent Office until February 3, 2006. Examiner Zervigon had responded to the Petition via telephone to Keith Taboada stating that the period for reply would be restarted from the February 3, 2006 actual mailing date of the Final Office Action.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

35 U.S.C. §102(b) Claim 23

Claim 23 stands rejected as being anticipated by *Komino* (U.S. Patent No. 6,156,151). The Applicants respectfully disagree.

Independent claim 23 recites elements not taught or suggested by *Komino*. *Komino* teaches a lower baffle plate 118 which is constituted by part of the central casing part CC defining the processing chamber 101 (column 6, lines 26-27). As is evident from Figures 1 and 2, to which the Examiner refers, the lower baffle plate 118 is supported by and touches both the interior walls of the chamber and the substrate support pedestal. The lower baffle plate 118 taught in *Komino* is not configured to be in laterally spaced-apart relation relative to the substrate support pedestal and sidewalls of the processing chamber, as recited in claim 23. Thus, *Komino* does not teach or suggest a restrictor plate in a laterally space-apart relation relative to the sidewalls of a processing chamber, as claimed by the Applicants.

Thus, the Applicants submit that independent claim 23 is patentable over *Komino*. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the rejection be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

35 U.S.C. §102(b) Claims 23 and 24

Claims 23 and 24 stand rejected as being anticipated by *Li* (U.S. Patent No. 6,448,536). The Applicants respectfully disagree.

Independent claim 23 recites elements not taught or suggested by *Li*. *Li* teaches an annular rectifying plate disposed between a shield frame and an inner surface of a process chamber. Thus, the annular rectifying plate 26 taught in *Li* is disposed to the inner wall of the chamber 1. *Li* does not teach or suggest a restrictor plate in a laterally space-apart relation relative to sidewalls of a process chamber, as recited in claim 23. Thus, *Li* does not teach or suggest all the elements of the restrictor plate, as claimed by the Applicants.

Thus, the Applicants submit that independent claim 23, and claim 24 depending therefrom, are patentable over *Li*. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request these rejections be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Claims 1-3, 5-6, 9-11, 14-16, 18 and 25

Claims 1-3, 5-6, 9-11, 14-16, 18 and 25 stand rejected as being unpatentable over *Komino*, in view of *Yonenaga* (U.S. Patent No. 5,972,114). The Applicants respectfully disagree.

Independent claims 1, 10 and 23 recite elements not taught or suggested by the combination of *Komino* and *Yonenaga*. The teaching of *Komino* has been discussed above. *Yonenaga* teaches using a single annular support column 48 to support and connect a flow regulator plate 46 coupled to sidewalls of a process chamber 12. *Yonenaga* fails to teach, show, or suggest a modification to *Komino* that would yield at least one restrictor plate supported within the semiconductor processing chamber by **a plurality of** support pins, as recited by claims 1 and 10; or a restrictor plate in a laterally space-apart relation relative to sidewalls of the processing chamber, as recited by claim 23.

Thus, the Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 10 and 23, and claims 2-3, 5-6, 9-11, 14-16, 18 and 25 depending therefrom, are patentable over *Komino* and *Yonenaga*. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the rejection be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Claims 7, 8, 13, and 19-22

Claims 7, 8, 13, and 19-22, stand rejected as being unpatentable over *Komino* in view of *Yonenaga*. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

As discussed above, independent claims 1 and 10, from which claims 7, 8, 13, and 19-22 depend, are patentable over *Komino* and *Yonenaga*. Neither *Komino* nor *Yonenaga*, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests at least one restrictor plate supported within the semiconductor processing chamber by **a plurality of** support pins, as recited by claims 1 and 10.

Thus, the Applicants submit that claims 7, 8, 13, and 19-22, that depend from claims 1 and 10, are patentable over *Komino* in view of *Yonenaga*. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the rejection be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

NEW CLAIMS

The Applicants have added new claims 26-28. The Applicants believe that the new claims are fully supported by the specification and are patentable over the references of record. Thus, the Applicants submit that no new matter has been added and respectfully request allowance of these claims.

CONCLUSION

Thus, the Applicants submit that all claims now pending are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issuance are earnestly solicited.

If, however, the Examiner believes that any unresolved issues still exist, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Mr. Keith Taboada at (732) 530-9404 so that

appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

May 1, 2006



Keith P. TABOADA
Attorney Reg. No. 45,150
(732) 530-9404

Patterson & Sheridan, LLP
595 Shrewsbury Avenue
Suite 100
Shrewsbury, NJ 07702